A U M

To have a peace of mind not quite perfect is to deepen the awareness of peace.
—*Chinese Proverb*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLI **May, 1953** **No. 7**

THE PHILOSOPHY OF H. P. B.

DOCTRINES and teachings are offerings from which each may serve himself, according to need and capacity. Madame Blavatsky left a reservoir well filled—closer to the brim by far than had been possible in prior presentations of Theosophical studies. No survey of ancient and modern religions had ever before appeared with so much attention to detail, with such a scope of correlative reference, and none comparable has even been attempted since her publication of *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine.* Yet those who have sought to draw close to the essential meaning of H.P.B.'s efforts know that her aim far transcended the transmission and comparison of noble doctrines, however necessary that work might be. For those who recognized her as the friend of all who strive towards "a higher life," who sought and accepted her as counsellor, there was the life-giving *meaning* of all her labors to be discerned. This meaning was and is to be found in her philosophy, a philosophy which, though it could never be adequately systematized, yet pervaded all she wrote, explained why she wrote as she did, and suggested the use to which her writings could be put.

There are, undoubtedly, innumerable ways in which the philosophy of H.P.B. can be described; but since her philosophy was a subtle comprehensiveness rather than a system, a description is apt to be foreshortening or misleading. We can speak, however, of some of the central ideas and perspectives which her philosophy contained—just as H.P.B. herself could describe the outlook of Ammonius Saccas, great Alexandrian Theosophist of the third century. "Plotinus tells us," she

says, "that the secret *gnosis* or the knowledge of Theosophy, has three degrees—opinion, science, and *illumination.*" In Plotinus' words, as H.P.B. quotes the pupil of Ammonius in her article, "What is Theosophy?": "The means or instrument of the first is sense, or perception; of the second, dialectics; of the third, intuition." H.P.B. then summarizes with the condensed definition, "Theosophy is the exact science of psychology."

If we reflect upon the delicate balance of Madame Blavatsky's treatment of the religion vs. science controversy, her devotion to Plotinus' description of Theosophy becomes evident. On what grounds did she challenge religious orthodoxy? Upon the grounds that orthodoxy did away with the "science" of philosophy, and enthroned "opinions" (or "revelations"), confusedly identifying them with illumination. On what ground did she challenge the votaries of nineteenth century scientism? Upon the ground that they denied the possibility of "illumination," refused to recognize any transcendental element in man capable of seeing beyond physical conditioning. For open-minded students of either religious or scientific background, then, she offered both a challenge and the hope of synthesis, on a higher ground, between opposing views. In doing so she gave dynamic embodiment to the age-old Theosophical belief that the subject matter of religion could be approached by rational means.

Here was recognition of the legitimate claims of both science and religion—and a pointing to the errors of both. She sought to help men to see that the whole problem of enlightenment, and therefore of morality, depended upon acknowledging that "opinion, science and illumination" were three obligatory stages of perceptive growth, through which each must pass. Thus psychology—not an emasculated Western version, curiously insistent upon denying the existence of soul —but a psychology pivoting upon the doctrine of the Higher Self in man, was presented as the key to all man's "religious" and "scientific" dilemmas. Theosophy, she said, was never rightly to be regarded as vague mysticism, but inclusive of a disciplining of the reason, and provided means for developing the higher powers of mind. Only by such effort could man expect or deserve "illumination." Those who imagined it possible to pass directly from "opinion" to illumination could hardly avoid falling victim to their own conceits, while those who grasped the evolutionary fact that knowledge must grow through three

successive stages would alone develop sufficient impartiality to ferret out and banish personal and cultural delusions. Mere opinion is purely psychic, and can only be transcended by establishment of *Manasic* control.

Some of H.P.B.'s own words here emphasize the implicit dimensions of Ammonius' teaching. One of her mantramic phrasings, never forgotten when once pondered, asserts that the evolution of the soul, "the upward progress of the Ego, is a series of awakenings, each advance bringing with it the idea that now, at last, we have reached 'reality.' " It is the Higher Self *within* each one that "awakens," and, precisely because this, the only source of illumination, is internal, none can receive knowledge without laboring to develop a *science* of knowing. Only if the highest source of inspiration is thought to be external to man, does it become natural to suppose, as have so many religionists, that "illumination" may come suddenly, by divine favor. Here, then, is the psychological meaning of the doctrine of the Higher Self—H.P.B., in her article, *Our Three Objects,* calls it the *fact* of the Higher Self—which she said was "the key to all Theosophical successes." Within every man, she wrote, is that which is "colourless, cosmopolitan, unsectarian, sexless, unworldly, altruistic." When men respond to theosophical teaching, they respond to this view of themselves, a view which inspires the loftiest and most unselfish perspectives, perspectives revealing the folly of mere combative "opinion" as the source of either authority or "illumination."

It is part of the fundamental sanity of Plotinus that he always speaks of the vision of the One as an exceedingly rare experience. It is the consummation of a life-long quest of the highest, to be earned only by intense contemplation and unceasing self-discipline. He says nothing of supernatural favours granted for their encouragement to young aspirants. Nor are there any traces of those attempts to force the pace which in many mystics produce the terrible reactions which are described as the dark night of the soul. . . . The combination of healthy asceticism with humanism is the hall-mark of Platonists in all times.

—*Britannica* on Plotinus

THE TIDAL WAVE

The tidal wave of deeper souls,
Into our inmost being rolls,
And lifts us unawares,
Out of all meaner cares.
—LONGFELLOW

[H. P. Blavatsky wrote this prophetic article as the editorial for *Lucifer* of November, 1889. It now appears in THEOSOPHY for the fourth time, having last been reprinted in Volume 27 at page 496. Little need be said in introduction; the value and profound implication of the article are self-evident. Nowhere has H.P.B. made clearer the Olympian character of the intellectual and moral struggle which raged during the cycle of her work in the world—the struggle of the Spirit in Man to be free. The *full* meaning of "The Tidal Wave" will become manifest but gradually, as the cycle matures. Yet one thing is certain: the struggle continues unabated. The past records directions taken, but the "Tidal Wave" ever rolls on into the future, now triumphant, now hidden, in the direction *given*.—Editors.]

THE great psychic and spiritual change now taking place in the realm of the human Soul, is quite remarkable. It began towards the very commencement of the now slowly vanishing last quarter of our century, and will end—so says a mystic prophecy—either for the weal or the woe of civilized humanity with the present cycle which will close in 1897. But the great change is not effected in solemn silence, nor is it perceived only by the few. On the contrary, it asserts itself amid a loud din of busy, boisterous tongues, a clash of public opinion, in comparison to which the incessant, ever increasing roar even of the noisiest political agitation seems like the rustling of the young forest foliage, on a warm spring day.

Verily the Spirit in man, so long hidden out of public sight, so carefully concealed and so far exiled from the arena of modern learning, has at last awakened. It now asserts itself and is loudly redemanding its unrecognized yet ever legitimate rights. It refuses to be any longer trampled under the brutal foot of Materialism, speculated upon by the Churches, and made a fathomless source of income by those who have self-constituted themselves its universal custodians. The former would deny the Divine Presence any right to existence; the latter would accentuate and prove it through their Sidesmen and Church

Wardens armed with money-bags and collection-boxes. But the Spirit in man—the direct, though now but broken ray and emanation of the Universal Spirit—has at last awakened. Hitherto, while so often reviled, persecuted and abased through ignorance, ambition and greed; while so frequently turned by insane *Pride* "into a blind wanderer, like unto a buffoon mocked by a host of buffoons," in the realm of Delusion, it remained unheard and unheeded. Today, the Spirit in man has returned like King Lear, from seeming insanity to its senses; and, raising its voice, it now speaks in those authoritative tones to which the men of old have listened in reverential silence through incalculable ages, until deafened by the din and roar of civilization and culture, they could hear it no longer. . . .

Look around you and behold! Think of what you see and hear, and draw therefrom your conclusions. The age of crass materialism, of Soul insanity and blindness, is swiftly passing away. A death struggle between Mysticism and Materialism is no longer at hand, but is already raging. And the party which will win the day at this supreme hour will become the master of the situation and of the future; *i.e.,* it will become the autocrat and sole disposer of the *millions* of men already born and to be born, up to the latter end of the twentieth century. If the signs of the times can be trusted it is not the *Animalists* who will remain conquerors. This is warranted us by the many brave and prolific authors and writers who have arisen of late to defend the rights of Spirit to reign over matter. Many are the honest, aspiring Souls now raising themselves like a dead wall against the torrent of the muddy waters of Materialism. And facing the hitherto domineering flood which is still steadily carrying off into unknown abysses the fragments from the wreck of the dethroned, cast down Human Spirit, they now command: "So far hast thou come; but thou shalt go no further!"

Amid all this external discord and disorganization of social harmony; amid confusion and the weak and cowardly hesitations of the masses, tied down to the narrow frames of routine, propriety and cant; amid that late dead calm of public thought that had exiled from literature every reference to Soul and Spirit and their divine working during the whole of the middle period of our century—we hear a sound arising. Like a clear, definite, far-reaching note of promise, the voice of the great human Soul proclaims, in no longer timid tones, the rise and almost the resurrection of the human Spirit in the masses. It is now

awakening in the foremost representatives of thought and learning; it speaks in the lowest as in the highest, and stimulates them all to action. The renovated, life-giving Spirit in man is boldly freeing itself from the dark fetters of the hitherto all-capturing animal life and matter. Behold it, saith the poet, as, ascending on its broad, white wings, it soars into the regions of real life and light; whence, calm and godlike, it contemplates with unfeigned pity those golden idols of the modern material cult with their feet of clay, which have hitherto screened from the purblind masses their true and living gods. . . .

Literature—once wrote a critic—is the confession of social life, reflecting all its sins, and all its acts of baseness as of heroism. In this sense a book is of a far greater importance than any man. Books do not represent one man, but they are the mirror of a host of men. Hence the great English poet-philosopher said of books, that he knew that they were as hard to kill and as prolific as the teeth of the fabulous dragon; sow them hither and thither and armed warriors will grow out of them. To kill a good book, is equal to killing a man.

The "poet-philosopher" is right.

A new era has begun in literature, this is certain. New thoughts and new interest have created new intellectual needs; hence a new race of authors is springing up. And this new species will gradually and imperceptibly shut out the old one, those fogies of yore who, though they still reign nominally, are allowed to do so rather by force of habit than predilection. It is not he who repeats obstinately and parrot-like the old literary formulae and holds desperately to publishers' traditions, who will find himself answering to the new needs; not the man who prefers his narrow party discipline to the search for the long-exiled Spirit of man and the now lost TRUTHS; not these, but verily he who, parting company with his beloved "authority," lifts boldly and carries on unflinchingly the standard of the *Future Man.* It is finally those who, amidst the present wholesale dominion of the worship of matter, material interests and SELFISHNESS, will have bravely fought for human rights and *man's divine nature,* who will become, if they only win, the teachers of the masses in the coming century, and so their benefactors.

But woe to the twentieth century if the now reigning school of thought prevails, for Spirit would once more be made captive and silenced till the end of the now coming age. It is not the fanatics of the dead letter in general, nor the iconoclasts and Vandals who fight the

new Spirit of thought, nor yet the modern Roundheads, supporters of the old Puritan religious and social traditions, who will ever become the protectors and Saviours of the now resurrecting human thought and Spirit. It is not these too willing supporters of the old cult, and the mediaeval heresies of those who guard like a relic every error of their sect or party, who jealously watch over their own thought lest it should, growing out of its teens, assimilate some fresher and more beneficent idea—not these who are the wise men of the future. It is not for them that the hour of the new historical era will have struck, but for those who will have learnt to express and put into practice the aspirations as well as the physical needs of the rising generations and of the now trampled-down masses. In order that one should fully comprehend *individual* life with its physiological, psychic and spiritual mysteries, he has to devote himself with all the fervour of unselfish philanthropy and love for his brother men, to studying and knowing *collective* life, or Mankind. Without preconceptions or prejudice, as also without the least fear of possible results in one or another direction, he has to decipher, understand and *remember* the deep and innermost feelings and the aspirations of the poor people's great and suffering heart. To do this he has first "to attune his soul with that of Humanity," as the old philosophy teaches; to thoroughly master the correct meaning of every line and word in the rapidly turning pages of the Book of Life of MANKIND and to be thoroughly saturated with the truism that the latter is a whole inseparable from his own SELF.

How many of such profound readers of life may be found in our boasted age of sciences and culture? Of course we do not mean authors alone, but rather the practical and still unrecognized, though well known, philanthropists and altruists of our age; the people's friends, the unselfish lovers of man, and the defenders of human right to the freedom of Spirit. Few indeed are such; for they are the rare blossoms of the age, and generally the martyrs to prejudiced mobs and time-servers. Like those wonderful "Snow flowers" of Northern Siberia, which, in order to shoot forth from the cold frozen soil, have to pierce through a thick layer of hard, icy snow, so these rare characters have to fight their battles all their life with cold indifference and human harshness, and with the selfish ever-mocking world of wealth. Yet, it is only they who can carry out the task of perseverance. To them alone is given the mission of turning the "Upper Ten" of social circles from the broad

and easy highway of wealth, vanity and empty pleasures into the arduous and thorny path of higher moral problems, and the perception of loftier moral duties than they are now pursuing. It is also those who, already themselves awakened to a higher Soul activity, are being endowed at the same time with literary talent, whose duty it is to undertake the part of awakening the sleeping Beauty and the Beast, in their enchanted Castle of Frivolity, to real life and light. Let all those who can, proceed fearlessly with this idea uppermost in their mind, and they will succeed. It is the rich who have first to be regenerated, if we would do good to the poor; for it is in the former that lies the root of evil of which the "disinherited" classes are but the too luxuriant growth. This may seem at first sight paradoxical, yet it is true, as may be shown.

In the face of the present degradation of every ideal, as also of the noblest aspirations of the human heart, becoming each day more prominent in the higher classes, what can be expected from the "great unwashed"? It is the head that has to guide the feet, and the latter are to be hardly held responsible for their actions. Work, therefore, to bring about the moral regeneration of the cultured but far more immoral classes before you attempt to do the same for our ignorant younger Brethren. The latter was undertaken years ago, and is carried on to this day, yet with no perceptible good results. Is it not evident that the reason for this lies in the fact that [except] for a few earnest, sincere and all-sacrificing workers in that field, the great majority of the volunteers consists of those same frivolous, *ultra*-selfish classes, who "play at charity" and whose ideas of the amelioration of the physical and moral status of the poor are confined to the hobby that money and the Bible alone can do it. We say that neither of these can accomplish any good; for dead-letter preaching and forced Bible-reading develop irritation and later atheism, and money as a temporary help finds its way into the tills of the public-houses rather than serves to buy bread with. The root of evil lies, therefore, in a moral, not in a physical cause.

If asked, what is it then that will help, we answer boldly:—Theosophical literature; hastening to add that under this term, neither books concerning adepts and phenomena, nor the Theosophical Society publications are meant.

Take advantage of, and profit by, the "tidal wave" which is now happily overpowering half of Humanity. Speak to the awakening

Spirit of Humanity, to the human Spirit and the Spirit in man, these three in One and the One in All. Dickens and Thackeray both born a century too late—or a century too early—came between two tidal waves of human spiritual thought, and though they have done yeoman service individually and induced certain partial reforms, yet they failed to touch Society and the masses at large. What the European world now needs is a dozen writers such as Dostoevsky, the Russian author, whose works, though *terra incognita* for most, are still well known on the Continent, as also in England and America among the cultured classes. And what the Russian novelist has done is this:—he spoke boldly and fearlessly the most unwelcome truths to the higher and *even to the official classes*—the latter a far more dangerous proceeding than the former. And yet, behold, most of the administrative reforms during the last twenty years are due to the silent and *unwelcome* influence of his pen. As one of his critics remarks, the great truths uttered by him were felt by all classes so vividly and so strongly that people whose views were most diametrically opposed to his own could not but feel the warmest sympathy for this bold writer and even expressed it to him.

> In the eyes of all, friends or foes, he became the mouthpiece of the irrepressible no longer to be delayed need felt by Society, to look with absolute sincerity into the innermost depths of its own soul, to become the impartial judge of its own actions and its own aspirations.
>
> Every new current of thought, every new tendency of the age had and ever will have, its rivals, as its enemies, some counteracting it boldly but unsuccessfully, others with great ability. But such, are always made of the same paste, so to say, common to all. They are goaded to resistance and objections by the same external, selfish and worldly objects, the same material ends and calculations as those that guided their opponents. While pointing out other problems and advocating other methods, in truth, they cease not for one moment to live with their foes in a world of the same and common interests, as also to continue in the same fundamental identical views on life.
>
> That which then became necessary was a man, who, standing outside of any partisanship or struggle for supremacy, would bring his past life as a guarantee of the sincerity and honesty of his views and purposes; one whose personal suffering would be an *imprimatur* to the firmness of his convictions, a writer finally, of undeniable literary genius:—for such a man alone, could pronounce words capable of awakening the true spirit in a Society which had drifted away in a wrong direction.
>
> Just such a man was Dostoevsky—the patriot-convict, the galley-slave, returned from Siberia; that writer, far-famed in Europe and

> Russia, the pauper buried by voluntary subscription, the soul-stirring bard, of everything poor, insulted, injured, humiliated; he who unveiled with such merciless cruelty the plagues and sores of his age. . . .

It is writers of this kind that are needed in our day of re-awakening; not authors writing for wealth or fame, but fearless apostles of the living Word of Truth, moral healers of the pustulous sores of our century. France has her Zola who points out, brutally enough, yet still true to life—the degradation and moral leprosy of his people. But Zola, while castigating the vices of the lower classes, has never dared to lash higher with his pen than the *petite bourgeoisie,* the immorality of the higher classes being ignored by him. Result: the peasants who do not read novels have not been in the least affected by his writings, and the *bourgeoisie* caring little for the *plebs,* took such notice of *Pot bouille* as to make the French realist lose all desire of burning his fingers again at their family pots. From the first then, Zola has pursued a path which though bringing him to fame and fortune has led him nowhere in so far as salutary effects are concerned.

Whether Theosophists, in the present or future, will ever work out a practical application of the suggestion is doubtful. To write novels with a moral sense in them deep enough to stir Society, requires a great literary talent and a *born* theosophist as was Dostoevsky—Zola standing outside of any comparison with him. But such talents are rare in all countries. Yet, even in the absence of such great gifts one may do good in a smaller and humbler way by taking note and exposing in impersonal narratives the crying vices and evils of the day, by word and deed, by publications and practical example. Let the force of that example impress others to follow it; and then instead of deriding our doctrines and aspirations the men of the twentieth, if not the nineteenth century will see clearer, and judge with knowledge and according to facts instead of prejudging agreeably to rooted misconceptions. Then and not till then will the world find itself forced to acknowledge that it was wrong, and that Theosophy alone can gradually create a mankind as harmonious and as simple-souled as Kosmos itself; but to effect this theosophists have to act as such. Having helped to awaken the spirit in many a man—we say this boldly challenging contradiction—shall we now stop instead of swimming with the TIDAL WAVE?

THE MORAL "OUGHT"

WERE it not for the fact that the moral "ought" affects people so differently, we should all probably become confirmed materialists and amoralists simply in self-defense. For if, as is obviously not the case, the injunction to do what we "ought" to do gained the same response from everyone, the uniformity of nature which would make this possible would itself be evidence that morality is not an inner, but an outer affair, depending upon the close following of instructions received.

How, then, shall we account for the variety of responses to the moral ought? Children are manifestly the most natural in reacting to moral appeal. Most children make no particular fuss about being told what is their "duty." In fact, a sensitive adolescent, but lately arrived at the stage where any sort of direction given to his moral sense by another seems a presumptuous invasion of his private life, will often marvel at the child's placid acceptance of instruction in his duty. A normal child, of course, will resist too much of this sort of thing, especially if it is done without any understanding of childhood and without a reasonable amount of justice on the part of the adult. But, by and large, children are natural moralists. They are very quick to pattern their comments about other children and the people around them in terms of moral judgment.

Assuming that there is a right and a wrong about this, it seems fairly evident that what is natural in a child's response to direct "moral" instruction results from the fact that the child is more a psychic being than he is anything else, and the psychic nature has to be told what to do in specific terms. This is the province of morality—to establish canons of behavior. A predominantly psychic being has no security without an easily accessible catalogue of right and wrong actions. Morality for the small child, then, in these terms, is a matter of performing in the approved way, according to custom and the will and wishes of the parent. It is, so to say, the result of a "conditioning" process, instituted by older people for any one of several reasons. Parents may insist that a child behave in a certain way simply for their own convenience—because they are tired, or because they suppose that the best child is one affording a minimum of bother. Again, the moral "oughts"

imposed may arise from the parents' interpretation of conventional ideas of good and evil—from a strong sense of propriety and conformity. Finally, they may grow from a desire on the part of the parents to prepare the young for as much freedom as possible in later life, and this will naturally involve the formation of habits of personal discipline during the early years.

All these things may be done to or for children, to which the children more or less passively submit, for, being psychic, they have no standard of judgment by which to measure the discrimination of their elders. Their future development, then, is inevitably affected by the sort of moral "oughts" to which they are exposed almost from infancy. As time goes on, however, the character of the indwelling ego must naturally play a part in the reactions of the child. In fact, childhood might be psychologically defined as the period of slow transition from a psychic to a *manasic* life—a development which is accompanied by a parallel emergence of what has been termed the "kamic principle." Some children, animated by egos of self-reliant past, if exposed to the reasonless moralizing of parents intent upon conformity, will early begin to build up pressures of resistance to the requirements of "goodness" as expressed by the moral "ought." Such children may easily seem to turn out as "bad" children who do not "love" their parents, who are "selfish" and "inconsiderate"—as, indeed, they may in a sense be. For upon what ground should we expect children to be so much wiser than their parents that they are able to act like little philosophers at the age of ten, twelve, or fourteen? Such children may be trying confusedly to define for themselves the meaning of freedom, and have received absolutely no help at all from their parents in this exceedingly difficult task. Small wonder if they seem insensitive to the vastly righteous appeals of their elders, whose knowledge of what is "right" is far greater than their understanding of what it means for a human being to pass from one basis of action to another—from that of a child to that of a youth.

That there will be some simon-pure selfishness in all this is hardly avoidable. Further, some children will be so tempestuously rebellious, by karmic endowment, as to make such talk of freedom and self-reliance seem almost ridiculous. Yet the realities of "growing up" involve all these factors in varying degree. What the parent has to realize is that the one thing he *cannot* do—cannot do, and remain an intelligent and

honest human being—is to apply some simple formula to a situation which calls for the maximum of discrimination. There is no such thing as a child that is "easy" to bring up. Even the Buddha gave his father a bad time. How would *you* like it if your bright and promising young son took off silently in the night, and you later heard that he had decided to wander earth in rags? It may be argued that Buddha, after all, was different. He was indeed, yet we are not discussing Buddha, but Buddha's father. Doubtless, if some supernatural being had appeared to the King and explained that his son was destined to fulfill a world-changing mission, the King would have felt considerably better. As we recall, something of the sort did occur, according to the story. Nevertheless, Buddha's father did his best to circumvent any such unconventional nonsense on the part of the young prince. Besides, what Gautama became was Gautama's affair, not the King's. So with our own children. They may not turn out to be Buddhas, but that is their responsibility, not ours. Our responsibility is to do what we can to make them self-reliant and free. These, at any rate, are undeniably qualities prerequisite to Buddhahood.

The other extreme of response to the moral ought is that of the wise man. It takes a wise man to listen patiently while someone tells him what he ought to do—to weigh the suggestion impartially, and then either to do it or not do it, according to his best judgment. What sort of wisdom is this? It is the wisdom which recognizes that when another person is so foolish as to tell you what you ought to do, this action need not be taken as an attack on your personal character. There may even be some sense in the proposal, regarded as simply a suggestion. The man who reacts in this way has reached what may be called philosophical maturity. He knows that the long passage from childhood to wisdom is really a transfer of the source of the moral ought from others to oneself. The highest point of origin for direction in moral behavior is always the man himself. So long as he is morally insecure, tending to look outside for instruction, so long will he be sensitive to the moralizings of others. Only when he is completely master of his own moral decision can he hear the preachments of others with equanimity.

Between the docility of the child and the serenity of the sage runs the whole gamut of moral development. These, of course, are only "types" of the extremes of response. One often encounters an oldster who listens anxiously to whatever is said to him, watching for some faint

intimation of personal criticism, ready to blow up like a volcano if he finds what he is looking for. Then there is the child who seems strangely endowed with calm in the face of agitated commands from adults. He may obey, or he may quietly explain why he is going to do something else—a procedure which, if admirable in principle, seldom adds to the harmony of the occasion. The point at issue, here, is that every human beings stands in a relationship to the idea of the moral ought which is uniquely his own relationship, representing his position on the path to maturity. It is this point which parents and teachers, and all who try to enter into constructive relationships with their fellows, need to recognize.

When it is said that Theosophy has no creed, the idea conveyed is that in Theosophy the individual deduces the moral ought for himself, on the basis of general principles. We may note that the devotional books, while concerned with the moral ought above all else, address this problem in the broadest terms. They deal with the foundations of moral decision, leaving particular decisions to the individual, it being obvious that decisions which are directed by book or person lose their morality by having an outside point of origin. Occasionally, one finds specific direction in the Theosophical literature, as for example in Wm. Q. Judge's *Letters That Have Helped Me.* Yet if we read Mr. Judge carefully, we shall see that his recommendations have to do with a kind of childishness in human nature, and that, further, there exists a relationship of trust between him and his correspondent such as makes his letters privileged communications. But just because of this quality in Mr. Judge, who was an extraordinarily wise man, we need to be particularly careful in how we imitate him—it is the wisdom we should try to copy, and not the instruction of others. We may note that the Theosophical Movement fell into difficulties much more from people trying to tell others where their duty lay, than from any failure or reticence in this respect.

Finally, in this matter of bringing up children, there is far more value in using the situations which arise during childhood as means of preparing the young for reflective decision than in seizing upon them as opportunity for conveying doctrinally "correct opinions," or for pointing out where "duty" lies. For example, nearly every Theosophical parent has this experience at some time or other: the child of five or six, telling about a playmate or the playmate's parents, or a kinder-

gartener, or grade teacher, will say, "They believe in *God,* don't they? *We* don't, *do* we?" Question: Do we respond with pride, "That's right, Johnnie!" Or is the we-are-better-than-those-other-people aspect of the little moralist's announcement more important to deal with than anything else? One reply, "Well, now, I'm not so sure what *you* think about God," might help to slow down the child's pat classification of people in the Thoughts-About-God department, at the same time gently conveying the notion to the youngster that imitation of his parents' supposed "beliefs" may not be the best way to gain hearty approval from them. And the subject can still be discussed if, at the moment, this seems a good thing to do.

Children—and adults—must move toward the free world of moral self-determination each at his own pace, a progress much more difficult for some than for others. A civilization invariably strikes a general average of the amount of moral direction required by the people of the time, this average being expressed in various forms of convention, custom, tradition, and law. Within the civilization, also, are to be found a thousand and one special systems of "moral ought," reflecting group attitudes and conceptions of moral development. It is the genius of Theosophy, however, to recognize that the human response to the moral ought is both an individual and a *changing* reality, which makes of moral education a project in soul education, while acknowledging, at the same time, true soul education to be always self-education. The cycle of incarnation leads the individual from infancy to childhood, from childhood to youth, from youth to maturity, and from maturity to age, but the course from innocence to knowledge of good and evil, and from knowledge of good and evil to wisdom, is found, followed, and fulfilled only by the man himself. In this course, the moral ought slowly changes from an environmental influence into an inner vision, and wise, indeed, the parent, teacher, guardian, or friend who understands the delicately altering balances of this transition, and gives what help he can.

RACE DISCRIMINATION

As is the inner, so is the outer; as is the great, so is the small; as it is above, so it is below; there is but One Life and Law; and he that worketh it is One. Nothing is inner, nothing is outer; nothing is great, nothing is small; nothing is high, nothing is low, in the Divine Economy. —HERMETIC AXIOM

THE ideal and fact of Universal Brotherhood, spread broadcast in the last century by H. P. Blavatsky, is fast taking root in the minds of many leading thinkers, and this is a welcome sign. H.P.B., however, well aware of the deficiency of the supposed proofs for the necessity of brotherhood as submitted by materialistic systems of thought, stated: "The identity of our physical origin [of which science speaks] makes no appeal to our higher and deeper feelings. Matter deprived of its soul and spirit, or its divine essence, cannot speak to the human heart. But the identity of the soul and spirit, of real, immortal man, as Theosophy teaches us, once proven and deep-rooted in our hearts, would lead us far on the road of real charity and brotherly goodwill."

In essence all life is one, but on the more material planes contrasts and differentiations are essential to progress and growth. William Q. Judge once observed: "How intelligent must be the power that strives to keep each and every one of us totally different *on the whole,* while, if analyzed, we possess some traits in common. . . ." By failing to avail themselves of a philosophical and metaphysical foundation for the ideal of brotherhood, modern thinkers have tended to confine themselves to physical evidences of identity, and have ignored obvious differences between the races.

As a background to understanding the problem of the races in the light of Theosophical philosophy, it should be stated that human evolution is held to take place in seven stages, each lasting millions of years. During each period one Great Race is developed, composed of seven sub-races, which in turn have further divisions. At present, five Great Races have come sequentially upon the scene, the Sixth and Seventh are yet to be born. As these Great Races overlap, the successor appearing during the maturity of its predecessor, we find at present not only Fifth-Race humanity, but large numbers of Fourth, and even remnants of the

Third Race. Fifth-Race human beings are said to be found amongst the American and European white races, the Aryan Indian, and Semitic peoples, while the American Indian, and the Mongolian types such as the Chinese, the Eskimo and the Finn, are indicated to be members of various sub-races of the Fourth Great Race. The dwindling tribes of Africa, Australia, and other remote portions of the globe, may include some late Third or early Fourth Race humans. The members of these earlier races will enter into the later ones when the necessary experience provided by their present embodiment is completed. For each Great Race, under evolutionary law, is developing senses, faculties, and powers appropriate to the state of consciousness and degree of unfoldment of the souls embodied therein.

If the various Great Races are compared to grades in a school, it will be easy to see that the souls that now comprise the later races have already passed through the earlier grades. And in time those earlier races will "disappear" when the last class of human egos connected with this earth proceeds to more advanced stages. This is in accord with the ethnologists' findings that the language and customs of primitive tribes are often highly complex, thereby revealing that those races were once the habitation of more developed peoples now reincarnated in the rising civilizations of the East and West.

It would be foolish to assume that all men of all races are "equal" in intellectual, mental, psychic and moral capacities, as this would be to ignore the whole logical story of Man's evolution. At present, though, all the original seven primeval races of men are mixed "by amalgamation" in inextricable confusion, and it does not follow that the so-called "lower" races are necessarily "inferior," simply because they have undertaken the journey of human evolution at a later period than have others. Degradation applies only in those instances where members of "higher" races, through perpetual abuse of their powers, merit incarnation in less specialized forms, resulting eventually in their destruction. The expression "higher" races, in this context, clearly, carries no necessary connotation of superiority, nor have members thereof rightful cause for pride or feelings of exclusiveness. Some designation, however, is needed, and "higher" should here be defined as primarily meaning *greater moral responsibility*—for the average of the "race" considered. In an infinite universe there are infinite degrees of beings both above and below, and it always will be so. How futile,

then, to cherish ambitions of gaining precedence over one's fellows! Jealousy of those who in terms of timescale or circumstance, are apparently "above," and contempt for those "below," is the greatest of all delusions. According to *The Ocean of Theosophy,* "the brighter planets, such as Venus, are the habitation of still more progressed entities, once as low as ourselves, but now raised to a pitch of glory incomprehensible for our intellects." From their standards, our most advanced races might appear as barbarians.

No being who fulfills his natural duty, however confined its area, is less important to the universal scheme than the highest conceivable intelligence. The atom in its place and the Chohan in his, are equals, in that each is equally indispensable and unique in contribution to the whole. Western races are obsessed with the notion that to be first in any achievement is an indication of stature and merit. Of the buds that bloom on a rose bush, which is superior, the first or the last? Each in its turn has its day in the sun. An actor with but a walk-on part may feel far inferior to the leading lady or man, yet his simple performance may give the cue to the hero at an important juncture in the play.

Real distinctions between beings, we see, are not to be found in outer form or circumstance, but must be sought as *inner* values in terms of attitudes and motive. For example, a primitive savage who faithfully and unselfishly performs his Dharma is superior in the eyes of Nature to the brilliant scientist or politician who seeks only fame and glory. Appearances frequently deceive; high souls may choose incarnation in lower castes and races to accomplish benefits to all mankind, and so adepts, themselves, may be members of such races. According to Mr. Judge, there are adepts "at work with certain individuals in some of the aboriginal tribes in America, as among those are Egos who are to do still more work in another incarnation and they must be prepared for it now."

Incarnation in the humbler races provides innumerable opportunities. Every race body is doomed to eventual extinction, as all bodies are, but by eliminating in oneself and one's family all the defects of that race and accentuating only its virtues, karmic connection with that race in its descent is severed, and avenues are opened to incarnation in races that are on the rise. In addition, by availing oneself to the maximum of the advantages offered, the usefulness of the race is prolonged, its premature destruction prevented, and beneficent currents engendered that

will aid and not ensnare other egos when their turn arrives to use these race instruments. Constructive Skandhas, astral, kamic, mental, and Buddhic are thereby created, causing improvement in race bodies for the future, and improving lines of heredity on all planes of being. It is also apparently within the power of the lower races to furnish excellent examples of living to races who are in the ascendancy. Having, in many cases, due reverence for the wisdom of the past, transmitted by way of tradition and high patterns of cultural living, and by living closer to Nature than the more intellectual portion of mankind, these seemingly immature peoples know many of her secrets that can be transmitted profitably in such fields as education, psychology, sociology, agriculture, music, and medicine.

Summarizing this phase of the problem, no matter what the race, if one endeavors to eliminate its liabilities and strengthen its assets, he is on the side of the rising tide of evolution, and is as noble and important as any other ego engaged in the same alchemical task.

Another puzzling question to be considered is this: if the Fifth Great Race represents the advance guard of human evolution on this planet, how and why do so many of low morality find incarnation therein? Could it be they have prematurely incarnated in the race, tending to impede its progress, as a result of neglect and maltreatment by higher races in previous lives? "Take, for instance, the United States and the Red Indians. The latter have been most shamefully treated by the nation. The Indian Egos will be reborn in the new and conquering people, and as members of that great family will be the means themselves of bringing on the due results for such acts as were done against them when they had red bodies. Thus it has happened before, and so it will come about again." Reversing this picture, members of more advanced races may temporarily be forced to incarnate in less civilized groups, owing to karmic debts. Soldiers when released from foreign service often leave behind native wives and offspring for whom they refuse to assume responsibility. In another life that obligation may be enforced upon them by incarnation in those strains. Persistent race or religious hatred and persecution may exact analogous penalties. Frequently the very individuals most incensed by prejudice shown against *themselves* are the most intolerant toward others on the slightest provocation. Their extreme sensitiveness may be a karmic reaction from participation in crimes against races or creeds in prior lives. *Light on*

the Path offers this thought on prejudice:

> If you allow the idea of separateness from any evil thing or person to grow up within you, by so doing you create Karma, which will bind you to that thing or person till your soul recognizes that it cannot be isolated . . . remember that the soiled garment you shrink from touching may have been yours yesterday, may be yours tomorrow. . . . The self-righteous man makes for himself a bed of mire.

However, entirely indiscriminate combinations unnecessarily may prolong the feverish "boiling" of the racial melting pot and postpone the time when the new race in all its purity can be established. To mix a new race with races that reached their maturity millions of years ago and now are in their decline, may be cause for confusion.

A lecture of Mr. Judge's indicates powerful factors for the production of faults springing from one's line of physical heredity. "This line may run back into the most strange and peculiar places, and be found winding in and out among manners and minds not suspected by us. Suppose your physical line of descent comes through Danes or Norwegians and mine through the French. There will be to some extent a want of sympathy and appreciation on the mental plane between us. . . . There will be a tendency always for the physical, including the brain, to show the characteristics which result from the preponderance of inherited faculties and dispositions." An ancient aphorism on Karma states that only in Kali Yuga—the age of selfishness and separateness—is there paradoxically a mixture of family and therefore races. In the golden and other ages, when the spirit of true brotherhood prevails, families and races are "kept pure and distinct." Certain racial and cultural blendings, however, seem highly essential in the dark age to break down clannishness, provincialism, and religious bigotry, and to produce a new race uniting the best qualities of all.

"The wise man seeketh for that which is homogeneous with his own nature"—in order that all others may likewise reach to the plane of universal homogeneity.

I had to find some means of reaching further, and struck on this, which is as old as old age. I am not separate from anything. "I am that which is." That is, I am Brahma, and Brahma is everything. After pursuing this course a while, I found it easier to return to a contemplation of all men as myself.

—W. Q. JUDGE

THOUGHTS ON AMBITION

AT the adolescent stage of our development, when the intellect is beginning to bloom, the majority of us conjure up a rosy future in which, through diligent application and perseverence, we shall realize our most cherished dreams. The germ of ambition is stirring in lower manas (mind), and unless this potency is directed into altruistic channels, the personal ego may easily become dazzled by the glitter of material possessions.

The tentacles of unbridled ambition, if allowed to sink and take root in the mind, may prove to be but the sinister progeny of greed, and when the history of this age is written, the masterful force of ambition will be accorded special recognition for the influential part it has played in shaping the course of events. To what can we attribute the mounting dissatisfactions and unrest prevalent amongst certain nations, if not to the imperialistic aspirations fostered in the past by ambitious powers? "As with individuals so with nations." If, instead of lending assistance to the general betterment of living conditions and the promotion of spiritual aspirations, the pernicious power of ambition is allowed to center on the acquisition of material things, disastrous karmic consequences must inevitably ensue.

Even those gifted intellectually are constantly being led away from their higher perceptions by an ambitious ego into devious channels of thought and action, not infrequently jeopardizing or even sacrificing loftier principles for a mess of political or commercial pottage. Most of us at one time of our lives have been trapped in the whirligig of schemes for personal advancement; the wise man is he who can differentiate between true and false "ambitions," who can evaluate each experience by the light from within, which, if nurtured carefully by daily contemplation, will enable him to perceive the true nature of his dreams of advancement.

In *Light on the Path* we are counselled to "kill out ambition," the first curse, that enemy of man which leads him to seek superiority over his contemporaries. Ambition, on the other hand, while a great deceiver, is also a karmic means from which we learn, since through unbiassed understanding of its power we can use the power of Will it so imperfectly represents for the spiritual gain of ourselves as well as

others. The *Voice* also reminds us "to work as those who are ambitious" —an apparent contradiction in terms, we think, until through our study of Theosophy it is revealed that both precepts are aspects of an almost overpowering "urge onward" common to mankind—the power of the Will.

To view in retrospect the frenzied activities of this restless age, with its insatiable hungers, its mad chase after fleeting pleasures, its incessant drive for the accumulation of profits by any available means, one is moved to regret that such colossal energy could not be directed into more worthy channels. Would, for instance, that a modicum of such unremitting drive were expended in plans for the alleviation of misery, suffering, and distress among the underprivileged. Each of us as individuals (and collectively, too, as nations) must learn the very necessary lesson: that it is only through and by means of suffering and sacrifice that we can advance along the perilous path to a state in which, although working as those who are ambitious, neither pleasure nor pain will affect us. It may be thought that such a state would mean negation; on the contrary, those who are "ambitious" in the proper vineyard garner spiritual knowledge to be held in trust for those who will be soon ready to receive its truths.

To be seeking achievement continuously is a sterling trait, a great and powerful lever—let no man decry it—but unless its force emanates from pure altruism, the results will crumble to dust like Dead Sea fruit. The philosophically "ambitious" distinguish their dynamic from its spurious counterpart; although they work as those who are ambitious, they are yet free from attachment—they know that there is no greater fallacy than to imagine that acquisition will bring happiness.

In our culture neurotic competitiveness differs from the normal in three respects. First, the neurotic constantly measures himself against others, even in situations which do not call for it. Second, whether or not there is awareness of the ambition there is always great sensitivity to any frustration of it. Third, is the implicit hostility in the neurotic's ambitions, his attitude that "no one but I shall be beautiful, capable, successful."

—KAREN HORNEY

THE POWER OF A HABIT

It is easier to prevent ill habits
than to break them.
—*Motto on Plato's Ring*

IT is a fundamental teaching of Occult Philosophy that every atom in the entire Universe has a life and memory of its own. Every atom possesses the faculty of receiving impressions, of retaining the impressions received, and of repeating those impressions for a period of time proportionate to the energy given them. Otherwise, how could the stone respond to the magnetic pull of Earth? Why does the sunflower lift its head to the warming rays of the sun, or the animal, heeding the call of hunger, find its way to food? All creatures respond to the inner, psychic force of impression. All creatures follow the path of impulse, instinct, habit. Man alone, who is not creature, but *Creator,* has the power to destroy old impressions and create new, to rise above the impulses, and institute fresh lines of action not determined by the stored-up memories of the past. He alone possesses power to repudiate the promptings of the lower conditioned lives, and, through the scintillating fire of *Manas,* to ignite and use the potencies of the Unmanifest. Man alone can aspire, hope, and envisage.

Because man is a copy in miniature of the Cosmos, he contains in himself, in germ, every force and element to be found anywhere in Nature. Though spiritual, changeless and unmanifest in the essential part of his being, he nevertheless draws to himself, during the process of evolutionary growth, specialized congeries of "lives," which provide him with bodies or vehicles on the various planes of Nature. Just as the Universe as a whole is animated, guided, and controlled by an almost endless series of hierarchies of sentient Beings, so is Man. The organs of the body are composed of cells, the cells are composed of molecules, the molecules of atoms, and the atoms of sensitive "lives," which respond to and reflect the varied intelligence of their hierarchies. For it is the intelligence in the Hierarchies that guides and controls each organ, causing the heart to beat, the stomach to digest, and the lungs, liver and spleen to perform their proper work. And all this is possible through the instrumentality of the "lives," through those sensitive centers of energy which possess the power to receive impressions, to remember, and to repeat.

Memory in the "lives," when innate, is called *instinct,* or natural impulse; when not innate, but acquired, it is *habit.* Instinct refers to those impulses which incite all the lower creatures, including animal and the lower man, to actions that are essential to their existence. Habit refers to impulses that are not necessarily essential to existence, but are consciously created and may be either helpful or detrimental. Who can say but that the instincts which now control so perfectly the well-ordered movements of Nature, may well have been, in ages gone by, only good habits—instituted and repeated so persistently by the intelligent Co-workers with Nature that they have now become laws within themselves?

Once an impression is given, it is the natural tendency in the "lives" to repeat the action automatically. Do something once, it is not yet habit; do it twice, the force of the impulsion grows; do it thrice, and the natural inclination of one's being is to move in the direction given; repeat the act several times over, and before one realizes what has happened, a *habit,* strong and difficult to break, has been acquired. Where is the person who has not had the experience of learning to do something wrongly, and is then faced with the task of learning it over again? It is far more economical to learn something right, even though it takes longer, than to go back and undo the errors, *plus* learning to do it properly.

On the other hand, habit, or memory in the "lives," is one of the most useful functions in the vast framework of natural economy. Without it, much more effort would be required for achievements within a single lifetime. Could there be great musical achievement except it be the accumulated results of preliminary periods of training? Could the typist enjoy skill unless nimble fingers could be taught to respond instantaneously to the lightning flash of thought? Could the archer hit the mark without perfectly co-ordinated help from every part of a trained body? Yoga, or skill in the performance of action, can only be achieved through habit, through the results gained from years and lifetimes of effort. Talent and genius are but the essence of lessons learned in other incarnations, and brought over undiminished into this one. Perfection in any field is determined by the care and fidelity with which men have trained their instruments to obey.

Habit possesses no moral quality. Neither good nor evil of itself, it is the fulcrum by which both the wise and the ignorant achieve their

respective ends. Habit is simply the way life acts, the method or manner in which Nature responds to causes which men themselves have sown. The wise man, having learned the Law, engenders only such impulsions as lead to good, while the ignorant heedlessly follow the path of least resistance. To the man of self-discipline, habit is a true friend, which, in time of temptation, takes him by the hand and says: "This is the proper way to go." But to the undisciplined, even though he aspire, his past wrong practices continually drag him down. Thus goes the saying that good men become better while evil men become worse. The time must come, in the long journey of the Soul, when the divergence between men of good and ill habits is so great that there is no possible conjunction between them. This is the period spoken of in the Bible as the separation of the sheep from the goats. Both will have become so habituated to their respective courses that the possibility of change in this cycle will have passed. *Now,* therefore, is the moment of choice.

"Sow a thought and reap an act; sow an act and reap a habit; sow a habit and reap a character; sow a character and reap a destiny." The seeds of destiny, verily, are wrapped up in the daily, hourly, and momentary habits of thinking that men pursue. It is a mistake to suppose that habit applies only to the body and its movements, for there are habits of thought and of imagination. Arjuna, in the sixth chapter of *The Bhagavad-Gita,* complains that the mind is full of agitation, turbulent, strong, and obstinate. "I believe the restraint of it," he says, "to be as difficult as that of the wind." Without doubt, agrees Krishna, the mind is hard to control, but it may be restrained "by practice and absence of desire."

One of the characteristic habits of Mind in this age, as stated in *The Ocean of Theosophy,* is "to naturally fly off from any point, object, or subject," to fly to some pleasant idea, or to fly to an unpleasant one. The highest and best disposition of *Manas,* of course, is not to fly at all, but, controlled by Will, to remain in concentration on that toward which it is directed. Thoughtful attention to natural duty, and the daily reading of good literature and devotional books such as *The Bhagavad-Gita, Light on the Path,* and *The Voice of the Silence* are ways and means of training the restless mind.

"With a knowledge of cycles," says Robert Crosbie, "habits are within our intelligent control." In correcting bad habits we must recog-

nize that they are cyclic and are bound to return under Law. When they do, one should set up an opposite cycle—a thought of an opposite nature, or a feeling of an opposite kind, or start an act of an opposite kind. Keep on doing that as best you can; finally the old cycle will be destroyed and a new one established. "It is a thousand times easier to contract a new habit than to get rid of an old one."

Bad habits may come on insidiously and seem to take complete possession of the person, but they can be cured, if he will take the opportunity of establishing a different cycle. He may note that they come at certain periods after intervals, and knowing that they are coming, be prepared for them. Then he may think of the happiest moments he has had, inaugurate some work of usefulness, or perform some act of charity, and continue along these lines as best he can. He won't succeed the first time, nor even the second time, perhaps, but if he keeps up the effort, each time he will find all the strength put into the previous efforts, until, by-and-by, instead of the old dark habits of despondency, there will be new and nobler ones, leading to peace and happiness.

It is always easier to initiate right action than to contend with the difficulties resulting from error. It is easier to speak truth, for example, than to explain a lie. It is easier to be on time than to catch up after being late. It is easier to perform our duty willingly than to wait for it to be forced upon us by Karma. It is easier to control one's temper than to regain calm after a fit of anger. And as the motto on Plato's ring says: "It is easier to prevent ill habits than to break them."

Students who crave the strange and miraculous may ask: "Why should the great Plato concern himself with considerations so commonplace as *bad habits?*" But the simplest statements are oftentimes the most occult. Every great achievement, like every great *fall,* has its birth in small beginnings on a simple grasp of truth. The Adept, or Yogi, is one who has so persistently pursued the path of good habits that he has become constitutionally incapable of deviating from the right path.

> Ill habits gather by unseen degrees,
> As brooks make rivers, rivers run into seas.
> —DRYDEN

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

WHAT is the extent of influence that an actor portraying an evil role in a drama of moral worth has upon the audience? Is the actor attuning himself to evil?

Plays of moral worth must have their villains and tempters to dramatize the moral idea behind the play. As we well know, a thing can only be known in its relation to other things. The contrast drawn between good and evil serves to emphasize more strongly the good. That hero is more truly and forcibly heroic after battling with and conquering the villain, than is the hero of whom it is merely stated that he *is* a hero, representing the forces of good. Such goodness would seem to be static, devoid of the struggle which gives it power.

The influence of such an evil character on the audience might be vast, and then again might be completely nil, depending upon the individuals comprising that audience. Each has his own free will to exercise as he sees fit. If a man refuses the influence of evil which is thrust upon him, it cannot have any effect. On the other hand, the vibrations of evil are very real and exist, if not for the strong, who can thrust them off, then at least for the weak who can not.

The influence of the portrayal of evil characters sometimes seems to settle on the head of the actor himself and may prove to be extremely dangerous. For there are those actors who lose themselves completely in the portrayal of a character. So involved, there would exist the possibility of attracting to himself the *kamarupas* of *actual* characters of that type. Such a state would seem to be very strongly akin to mediumship and could be harmful to both actor and audience.

It is a known fact that certain actors will get themselves so involved in a role that it is quite some time after their exit from the stage (or movie set) before they can get themselves back to normal. For instance, it is often difficult for an actor who has just been violently weeping in a scene to, upon his exit, "turn off the tears." Also, in some few cases a complete personality change occurs in which the actor becomes like the character he is portraying. He may remain so for the duration of the play or possibly longer. This would indicate need of exercising extreme caution on the part of any actor, and a control which can only be gained by a recognition of the reality of the soul.

The soul has as its immediate goal mastery over "the situation." And at every moment "the situation" is present, whether it be seen as a set of circumstances without or a set of conflicts within. Men, then, whether actors or not, should not allow the idea of the ego to be pushed so far in the background that they may lose sight of what man really is—the Self—and become identified with the bundle of emotions and feelings that make up the character he, as an actor, is assuming.

H.P.B. brings out a similar idea in *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 306), stating in relation to reincarnation—

> Intimately, or rather indissolubly, connected with Karma, then, is the law of re-birth, or of the re-incarnation of the same spiritual individuality in a long, almost interminable, series of personalities. The latter are like the various costumes and characters played by the same actor, with each of which that actor identifies himself and is identified by the public, for the space of a few hours. The inner or real man, who personates those characters, knows the whole time that he is Hamlet for the brief space of a few acts, which represent, however, on the plane of human illusion the whole life of Hamlet. And he knows that he was, the night before, King Lear, the transformation in his turn of the Othello of a still earlier preceding night; but the outer, visible character is supposed to be ignorant of the fact. In actual life that ignorance is, unfortunately, but too real.

In preventing oneself from becoming fully identified with anything less than the permanent Self, the motive inspiring any endeavor should be of prime consideration. The term "moral worth" denotes a central theme of inspiration and high ethical value; all roles within a play of philosophical intent are designed to point out, ultimately, that value. The great actor, then, would be beyond any evil influence, but would see his role in its true significance—as an aid in the development of the moral implications of the central theme.

Does Theosophy, and do groups of associates formed by Theosophical students, provide an outlet for the religious instinct in man? Many features of orthodox religion, one of which is ritualism, seem to give believers a "sense of balance" for their psychic natures.

Since statistics show (*Preface to Philosophy,* 1946) that within six of the world's major religions there are: 675 million Christians; 250 million Confucians; 250 million Moslems; 245 million Hindus; 150 million Jews, it seems reasonable to conclude that every civilization has

been accompanied by some kind of religious expression. But, from a Theosophical standpoint, formal observances are not regarded as the only outlet for man's "religious instinct." Overemphasis upon ritual must stem from the general misconception as to the meaning of religion. Naturally, if there is "belief" in an outside God, there will be dependence on the "outer," and ritualistic devotion to mere form will develop. Many factors contribute to this result, such as the great cultural malady of insecurity, which drives men to constantly look for emotional aids or for an authority supplying firm directions for conduct. Such invariably shy away from facing themselves, and ritualism makes this self-alienation even more attractive.

Of course, there is such a thing as true ritualism, which, when coupled with a true understanding of the laws of life, can produce beneficial results, but there are probably few who in this day know its proper use. Many of the American Indians, who once lived and worked with the laws of nature, and who understood true ritualism for the very reason that they *did* live according to nature, now find their traditional mode of life too difficult to maintain.

Just as ritualism has two sides, duality applies also to man's religious instinct. The very derivation of the word, religion, would bear this out in that it comes from the Latin "religio" meaning restraint or taboo—and is also taken from "religare" meaning to bind together. The "sense of balance" gained through ritualism, though, applies alone to the psychic nature, and there is a wide gap between comforting emotionalism and *mental* devotion. The former, however—passive reliance on forms—is what people generally refer to in speaking of the religious instinct. This passivity, if indulged, can but pull man towards negativism or even to mediumship. True Religion is The Way, the Path Uphill, not rest by the roadside. Hence, the *true* religious spirit is the soul's yearning and longing for knowledge of the higher purposes of Self—its striving to know Itself.

Since the religious instinct is inherent in *all* men, at least potentially, such outer masks as "religionism" or "agnosticism" could hardly affect its deep-seated reality. The outlets of this creative drive assume countless forms, for wherever we find MAN reaching upward—aspiring in his great music, the great Arts, in his noble idealisms; wherever the Good, the True, and the Beautiful are sought, there the religious spirit of creativity and solidarity is manifest.

Turning our ideas toward the Associates of U.L.T., however, enables us to be more specific. For then when we think of outlets for man's religious nature, we can refer to the very different appeal of such a doctrine as the "lighting" of Buddhi-Manas, possible for the Race as a whole. There are many available channels of expression which afford direct development and growth of this sort. For the victory of *manas* over the lower quaternary entails the strengthening and maturation of a higher power, through consistent expression, writing, and contemplation. No other system of thought, we think, is better suited as the focal point for directing psychic energies than Theosophy, the Wisdom-Religion. By contributing *creatively* (*i.e.,* manasically) through both the natural channels provided by U.L.T. and the less definitive channels of the Theosophical Movement at large, we may find "psychic balance."

When two people dislike each other and one attempts reconciliation with evident failure, what should his attitude and course of action be? Should he cease further attempts? How does he finally work such a thing out, and is he the one to determine the answer?

(a) Without an understanding of Karma one would have little reason to pursue reconciliation. Theosophy teaches the fulfilling of duties for the simple reason that they confront us, but we may also come to see more particular reasons. A dislike may be "many lives" old, and if so, it could hardly be straightened out in a few years. To cease striving to be friendly would be to question the universality of brotherhood. It would be to put off and increase the karmic debt between the two. An opportunity would be lost which might be a gateway to better things.

"Not giving up" still leaves several courses of action. Antagonism might be lessened if friendly advances are made at a "proper" time—a natural occasion. A gain might be made by just controlling the old feelings. Even without the cooperation of the other party involved, it is possible for one to settle his own debt in the matter. So evident failure shouldn't dissuade one from what seems obligatory.

(b) The motive of the person in desiring reconciliation should be looked into. If he desires the friendship of the other merely to set his own mind at rest and assure himself that he is well liked, his attempts sooner or later will lose their sincerity and ultimately defeat his pur-

pose through their lack of genuineness. If that person desires reconciliation because he abhors the viciousness of the situation and wants to act in a brotherly way, he should, working on that basis, be able to see whether or not his efforts are actually helping the situation or antagonizing the other person to such a degree that "brotherhood" is further away than ever. Sometimes a mental attitude will accomplish more than an hour's handshaking. The same medium that produced the animosity should be used to express a kindly mental feeling. The person who desires reconciliation should look first into himself and see whether the animosity he feels has a *container in himself*—because he cannot contain and maintain that for which he has no capacity.

(c) Perhaps if we attempt to correct the fault in ourselves and not go out of our way to be "over"-friendly, the occasion might arise when we would have a natural time to show our improved feelings.

The individual who is sincere in his desire to learn should first attempt to search within himself for those qualities which may add coals to the fire. We know that often the faults that are seen in others are merely reflections of our weaknesses. If the sincere person works to improve himself he at least refuses to allow further animosity to develop.

How could intelligence be defined so that the difference between the intelligence of the self-conscious being and that of the intelligences of nature will be clear? For instance, how could electricity be said to be intelligent? Man's intelligence is creative, but nature is only repetitive.

It could be said that only intelligent beings move according to Law, order, and in universal harmony. This would be why only intelligent matter can be directed or moulded to man's purposes. This is why there can be no dead matter. Natural intelligence creates and re-creates the forms from the patterns created by the intelligence of man. It might be said, too, that the highest goal of matter, as such, is the closest and most direct association with human intelligence. The ether spoken of in *Isis Unveiled* could be considered a kind of matter, evolved to such a degree that it can transmit men's words and even their thoughts and feelings.

NOTES ON THE KEY

THE concluding section of H.P.B.'s *Key to Theosophy,* entitled "The Future of the Theosophical Society," suggests itself for a more frequent re-reading than any other portion of the book. In the first place, once again H.P.B. stresses the fact that Theosophy demands dynamic embodiment in many forms. "Theosophy," she writes, "is synonymous with everlasting truth"—which means a true perception of man's relation to his evolutionary opportunities and responsibilities. While those philosophical principles upon which correct evaluation of the nature of Self and soul depends will never change, the opportunities and responsibilities are specific as well as general, and, as specifics, alter according to each karmic situation. Thus "the future of the Theosophical Society" (or Movement) can never be assured by a mere repetition of doctrines, however valuable these will continue to be as foci for reflection.

H.P.B. emphasizes, in particular, this point: that the success of Theosophical aims will depend "upon the amount of knowledge and wisdom possessed by those members on whom it will fall to carry on the work." The inquirer then professes an inability to see how the *"knowledge"* of professing Theosophists is as important a factor as their devotion. "Surely," he writes, "the literature which already exists and to which constant additions are still being made, ought to be sufficent." H.P.B. replies:

> I do not refer to technical knowledge of the esoteric doctrine, though that is most important; I spoke rather of the great need which our successors in the guidance of the Society will have of unbiassed and clear judgment. Every such attempt as the Theosophical Society has hitherto ended in failure, because, sooner or later, it has degenerated into a sect, set up hard-and-fast dogmas of its own, and so lost by imperceptible degrees that vitality which living truth alone can impart. You must remember that all our members have been bred and born in some creed or religion, that all are more or less of their generation both physically and mentally, and consequently that their judgment is but too likely to be warped and unconsciously biassed by some or all of these influences. If, then, they cannot be freed from such inherent bias, or at least taught to recognize it instantly and so avoid being led away by it, the result can only be that the Society will

> drift off on to some sandbank of thought or another, and there remain a stranded carcass to moulder and die.

How easy it has been to "lose by imperceptible degrees that vitality which living truth alone can impart" is demonstrated by the history of Theosophical organizations since the death of H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge. Viewing the matter in psychological terms, it is clear that not only organizations and societies have foundered on one or another variety of complacency; individual students, too, inside or outside of even the most auspicious affiliations, may allow themselves to feel "self-gratulation" because of supposed possession of H.P.B.'s "secret doctrine," and then, unfortunately, are no longer capable of either giving or receiving "*living* truth."

On the last page of the *Key,* H.P.B. voices the hope that those Theosophists who are able to keep fraternal affiliation as a "living and healthy body" will effect a marked lessening of prejudices and dogmatic illusions in all fields of thought. The modulus for such effort was left by H.P.B.'s own example, and involved two strenuous lines of parallel endeavor. First, for Theosophists to have "living" and "healthy" minds, they will need to transcend the common human propensity for thinking in creedal patterns. As H.P.B. elsewhere remarked, "The Theosophist is ever ready to welcome truth, under whatever new name." For such, Theosophy is not so much something to be "learned" or "taught," as a vision to be realized, and a method of study to be employed in making its realization possible. Just as competent "knowing" of the Theosophy of Buddha, of Pythagoras or of Plato is not the knowing of Theosophy in its entirety, so did H.P.B. recognize that even the most complete assimilation of all her writings could not supply the whole of Theosophical philosophy. Settled conviction in respect to the basic principles of Theosophy is one thing—the belief that Theosophy may have only one "authentic" form of expression quite another.

H.P.B., in the first passage quoted, implies that one of the most needed contributions to the cause of the Theosophical Movement is a goodly number of free, flexible minds—sufficiently flexible to appreciate Theosophical progress wherever it takes place, as in unfamiliar books, movements or phrasings. Continual revaluation of habitual forms of theosophic expression can then proceed *pari passu* with development of an "eager intellect"—eager because enthusiastic about

all of those trends in literature, psychology, religion and science which indicate the unfoldment of further Buddhi-manasic perceptions in the culture of the race. Theosophists who follow these admonitions, clearly, are best prepared to establish rapprochement between H.P.B.'s writings and the language spoken by inspired leaders in each of these fields. Thus it must be the business of every Theosophist who seeks to be more than a creedal adherent of doctrine to constantly add to the language of Theosophy, in accordance with the capacities, propensities and needs of his time. How else, we might well wonder, will a "new torchbearer of Truth find the minds of men prepared for his message"? When H.P.B. speaks of a "language ready for him in which to clothe the new truths he brings," what else can she have in mind than the results of such an *outgoing* endeavor as that discussed?

Since the last chapter of the *Key* closes with reference to new presentations of Theosophy which may be expected during the auspicious closing years of this century, it is particularly valuable to note the phrasing used by H.P.B. in speaking of this coming quarter-century. We fear theosophical students have often regarded such a time and place as a sort of final coming of the Messiah, marking the Millennium, whereas in truth H.P.B. indicates that there never will be a "final" revelation, but only cyclic quickenings of opportunity and progress in accord with the receptivity created by the periodic development of many new "languages" of the soul. On page 306 H.P.B. describes the cyclic efforts of adepts in these terms:

> I must tell you that during the last quarter of every hundred years an attempt is made by those "Masters," of whom I have spoken, to help on the spiritual progress of Humanity in a marked and definite way. Towards the close of each century you will invariably find that an outpouring or upheaval of spirituality—or call it mysticism if you prefer—has taken place. Some one or more persons have appeared in the world as their agents, and a greater or less amount of occult knowledge and teaching has been given out. If you care to do so, you can trace these movements back, century by century, as far as our detailed historical records extend.

We may note here the emphasis upon the *collective* nature of the "attempt" made by "those Masters." The word "Master" being in the plural, too, suggests that it is the cooperative effort of many great beings of such status which finally prepares a fit vehicle to serve the particular karmic opportunity. Further, in stating that "some one *or*

more persons" have often represented the message, she again indicates that the leadership and guidance involved is not one of personality, *but a leadership of mind and minds.* How easy it is for Theosophists who have not yet entirely rid themselves of spectacular religious thought-forms to imagine a single great being of awesome visage, blinding the world with his radiance, sweeping evil into the sea and establishing the golden age on earth! And precisely, perhaps, because it is so easy for men of all persuasions to associate great teachers with the imagined personal characteristics of a great leader, a much more subtle form of Theosophical energizing may occur as century the twentieth comes to a close.

Reflection is also invited upon H.P.B.'s description of cyclic readiness at the end of each century as "an outpouring or upheaval of spirituality, or call it mysticism if you prefer." What sort of "mysticism" is here meant? H.P.B., for instance, evidently regarded honest inquiry into spiritualistic phenomena as a part of growing "mystical" awareness. Perhaps wherever a probing into the unknown takes place for reasons other than those of emotional fascination or ambition, the inspiration must derive from an inward conviction that man has yet a long road to travel towards full awakening of his powers or perception. "Mysticism," in its broadest sense, then, may play a part in inspiring the discoveries of scientists, psychologists or sociologists. "Mysticism" may be simply the faith that many things we profoundly need to know cannot yet be approached by orthodox methods of inquiry, and that new avenues may now be explored.

It is always a readiness to embrace the new, and a corresponding willingness to relinquish the old, which signifies one's readiness for Theosophical understanding. The mere development of psychic powers and faculties is of little constructive significance, unless it occasions stimulation of the "mystical" urges in man's transcendental consciousness. Similarly, men may, and do, awaken to realization of "the transcendental" in nature and man without phenomenalistic promptings, and particularly should this be possible during an evolutionary cycle of intensified *manasic* activity. Today the tremendous transformations which have taken place in the western science of psychology have not come about through new forms of personal psychic experience, but by new forms of thinking *about* the psychic experiences of mankind as a whole. Such a trend, away from phenomenalism and toward philo-

sophical evaluation, is perhaps but a higher, most natural rebirth of nineteenth-century "mysticism." As a psychiatric writer remarked:

> Scientists, instead of seeing the universe as rigidly bound in law and predictability—as totally "unfree"—have begun to see it as unbelievably plastic and flexible and as having in it immense potentialities of the kind we think of as life.
>
> This is, in fact, the scientific news of our day; that the *livingness* of the universe has been returned to us.

Theosophical "mysticism" may have its root in just this sort of perception, and those who recognize that present thinking often reflects increased awareness of a universe "everywhere and in all its parts alive," can easily detect hopeful waves of the future already beginning to swell.

Two States of Mind

Consciousness is the mental activity in our state of being preoccupied with external reality—with acting. The unconscious is the mental experience in a state of existence in which we have shut off communications with the outer world, are no longer preoccupied with action but with our self-experience. The unconscious is an experience related to a special mode of life—that of nonactivity; and the characteristics of the unconscious follow from the nature of this mode of existence. The qualities of consciousness, on the other hand, are determined by the nature of action.

The "unconscious" is the unconscious only in relation to the "normal" state of activity. When we speak of "unconscious" we really say only that an experience is alien to that frame of mind which exists while and as we act; it is then felt as a ghostlike, intrusive element, hard to get hold of and hard to remember. But the day world is as unconscious in our sleep experience as the night world is in our waking experience. The term "unconscious" is customarily used solely from the standpoint of day experience; and thus it fails to denote that both conscious and unconscious are only different states of mind referring to different states of existence.

—Erich Fromm

ON THE LOOKOUT

The Dangerous Norms

Quotations from Joseph Wood Krutch in last month's Lookout serve as a good point of departure for calling attention to similar realizations on the part of other writers. Many sociologists, psychologists, critics, and essayists now are rallying to defend "freedom of thought"—for more reason, it appears, than that of sentimental attachment to what has been called "the tradition" of dissent. Even statistical sociological studies at times indicate that the submergence of individual judgment in waves of mass opinion frustrates the original thinking upon which the highest human happiness depends.

"The Lonely Crowd"

Naming thus his recent book, David Riesman, Yale University sociologist, provided a wonderful focus for contemplation. Is it not clear that men who strive only to be "just like everyone else"—who invariably follow the standards and subscribe to the opinions of those around them—can become "maladjusted" to their own aspirations at the very time that they gain "adjustment" to the prevailing "norm"? The man who belongs to the crowd, and in no sense to himself, is "lonely"—because he is alienated from the inward thrusts of creative endeavor and independent thinking. Riesman calls those whose lives are oriented around the desire to comply with ordinary standards "other-directed" men. In a concluding passage of *The Lonely Crowd,* the Yale professor sums up his conclusions:

> If the other-directed people should discover how much needless work they do, discover that their own thoughts and their own lives are quite as interesting as other people's, that, indeed, they no more assuage their loneliness in a crowd of peers than one can assuage one's thirst by drinking sea water, then we might expect them to become more attentive to their own feelings and aspirations.

Western religions, as Theosophical history shows, produced a feeling of emptiness in man—an emptiness which could never be filled save through self-knowledge, and if man be thought powerless to attain *self*-knowledge, he will naturally seek substitutes, to fill the void. This has been done; the substitutes are legion, but the emptiness remains.

A Loss of Freedom

Riesman continues:

> While I have said many things in this book of which I am unsure, of one thing I am quite sure: the enormous potentialities for diversity in nature's bounty and men's capacity to differentiate their experience can become valued by the individual himself, so that he will not be tempted and coerced into adjustment or, failing adjustment, into anomie. The idea that men are created free and equal is both true and misleading: men are created different; they lose their social freedom and their individual autonomy in seeking to become like each other.
>
> The autonomous person, living like everyone else in a given cultural setting, employs the reserves of his character and station to move away from the adjusteds of the same setting. For autonomy, like anomie, is a deviation from the adjusted patterns. . . . But whereas the adjusted person was driven toward his goals by a gyroscope over whose speed and direction he had hardly a modicum of control and of the existence of which he was sometimes unaware, his autonomous contemporary was capable of choosing his goals and modulating his pace. The goals, and the drive toward them, were rational, nonauthoritarian and noncompulsive for the autonomous; for the adjusted, they were merely given.

The Tyranny of the Consensus

Inspired by the work of the late Trigant Burrow, noted physician, scientist, and psychoanalyst, a volume of essays issued by Burrow's students and collaborators appeared last year under the title, *Our Common Neurosis* (Exposition Press, New York). One of the most striking passages in this book emphasizes the extent to which inertia—which H. P. Blavatsky called the most powerful of occult forces—can dominate a culture. Except for remarks by Burrow himself, all the essays are unsigned, and thus emphasize the fact that, here, rather than listening to the voice of a lonely rebel, we are now beginning to hear expression of a viewpoint reflected in many minds.

Dr. Charles B. Thompson, editor of *Our Common Neurosis,* introduces one of the essays with these remarks about the effect of inertia:

> It is easier to go along with the crowd than it is to make the effort to examine the springs of its action. It is so much less trouble to accept the popular fallacies that mark our social interchange than to examine them with the objective attitude of the scientist. This marked inertia of man in his approach to interrelational problems

was noted in the early years of group analysis, and forms the material of the following essay.

The Tempting Delusion

Next, under the sub-heading, "Who are the Insane?", these challenging paragraphs appear:

> We like to delude ourselves into thinking that what has received the stamp of social approval must be right.
>
> It is this delusion concerning the force of social approval that has caught us all in its subtle grip. It makes us afraid to dress, think, act differently from our neighbors. It makes each of us want to be better, richer, more brilliant than anyone else. It is responsible for our social competition, our industrial exploitation, finally our warfare. Being in its grip, we inevitably struggle against an understanding of our delusion. But in so far as there is a dissatisfaction with the present state of things, there is the need to see clearly the tendencies within ourselves that are responsible for it. A knowledge of these is not a matter of academic learning. There is required merely an understanding of the daily contacts among ordinary human beings, among ourselves. With this understanding we shall soon sense the fallacy of the conviction with which each of us claims his family to be the finest, his religion the truest, his country the greatest. It is such fallacies as these that goad us on to personal enmities, social feuds, international wars. If we are earnest in our purpose to weigh these things in the balance, we must be prepared to face the disquieting conclusion that there is insanity even among those of us who would not be technically regarded as "insane."

The Price of Mental Effort

The preface of H.P.B.'s *Key to Theosophy* stresses the need for the inquirer into Theosophical teachings to realize that considerable "effort" must be expended, that to the "mentally lazy or obtuse Theosophy must remain a riddle." Another essay in Dr. Thompson's collection probes the innumerable ways in which the force of inertia is reflected in mental laziness:

> Under the protection of the social consensus the human mind is prone to methods of reasoning that demand the least expenditure of thought. Inference is so much easier than examination. Its demand upon our energies is so much less. "It looks like" or "it seems as if" are far handier recourses for disposing of the facts of life than "it may be shown to be" or "it is." The truth is that of all our organs the brain is the laziest. From habits of long contamination with false impressions it tends to balk in its function and, wherever it can, it

finds a way to avoid its appointed work. "Nice discriminations are troublesome," remarks George Eliot. "It is so much easier to say that a thing is black, than to discriminate the particular shade of brown, blue or green to which it really belongs. It is so much easier to make up your mind that your neighbor is good-for-nothing, than to enter into all circumstances that would oblige you to modify that opinion."

SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS

This prevalent mental tendency is explicable only on the ground that there exists in the social mind today much the same tendency to false and easy inference that characterizes the mind of the single individual. It must not be supposed, however, that this lax manner of reasoning is by any means confined to the uneducated or even to people of average education. Instances of these quite easy short cuts are characteristic of many types of mind that are supposedly trained and scientific. Typical of such lapses even in the scientific mind is the tendency of the sociologist who, wishing, for example, to correct conditions as he finds them, attempts to organize a different regime without having first analyzed the deeper causes responsible for the disorders present in the social order as it now exists. The medical mind is likewise answerable for many current views that rest upon no sounder foundation than that of offhand, casual inference.

We should recognize to what extent physicians and sociologists themselves hold the unthinking attitude of the layman toward these problems. We should recognize that in their unfamiliarity with the essential factors in question, professional men too often disseminate opinions which are uttered for purposes of mere social edification and which, in their hastiness and superficiality of view, do not begin to approach the underlying causes of the conditions supposedly under examination.

"THE NEUROTIC PERSONALITY OF OUR TIME"

German-born psychiatrist Karen Horney's famous volume of the above title, first published in 1937, extended similar perceptions into the field of interpersonal relationships. Students of psychology often recognize that Dr. Horney's contributions marked a turning point in psychoanalytic thought, away from preoccupation with "social adjustment" and toward the recognition that many unusual individuals previously thought to be "out of step with happiness" were actually much closer to its realization than their lock-stepping contemporaries. Dr. Horney's introductory chapter contains this analysis:

One of the predominant trends of neurotics of our time is their excessive dependence on the approval or affection of others. We all

want to be liked and to feel appreciated, but in neurotic persons the dependence on affection or approval is disproportionate to the real significance which other persons have for their lives. Although we all wish to be liked by persons of whom we are fond, in neurotics there is an indiscriminate hunger for appreciation or affection, regardless of whether they care for the person concerned or whether the judgment of that person has any meaning for them. More often than not they are not aware of this boundless craving, but they betray its existence in their sensitivity when the attention they want is not forthcoming. They may feel hurt, for example, if someone does not accept their invitation, does not telephone for some time, or even only if he disagrees with them in some opinion. This sensitivity may be concealed by a "don't care" attitude.

A "Common Neurosis," Indeed

In a later chapter, drawing on clinical experience, Dr. Horney discusses the behavioral results of anxiety complexes and neurotic feelings of guilt. Remarking that patients in either category will go to any length to "avoid disapproval," she continues:

> Usually a person of this type is unable to endure the slightest difference of opinion, or even a difference of emotional emphasis, because in his thinking even a minute disagreement is equivalent to a criticism. Tendencies of this kind account to a great extent for what is called pseudo-adaptation. This is found in persons who in spite of a severe neurosis manage to maintain in their own eyes, and sometimes also in those of the people around them, an appearance of being "normal" and well adapted. In neurotics of this type one will scarcely ever go wrong in predicting an enormous fear of being found out or disapproved of.

Moral Implications

Harry Overstreet's latest book, *The Great Enterprise,* indicates how easily "fixated traditions" may corrupt the moral sense of man. Speaking the same language to which Dr. Horney and Dr. Burrow contributed so many useful terms and analytical concepts, Dr. Overstreet writes:

> When psychiatrists venture to speak of *cultural neurosis,* they are not using a mere figure of speech; nor are they trying to startle us by making an analogy with individual neurosis. They are pointing to a fact that stands in its own right: namely, that the influence of a culture upon its members is so potent that if—by ordinance, custom, or standards of success and prestige—it sets a premium upon neurotic behaviors, calling them right and natural, it will foster those behaviors in such multitude that they will increasingly dominate the culture and

> fixate it in a neurotic pattern. A culture that can be characterized as neurotic will, therefore, be one that has fixated in custom and institution behavior patterns that halt and distort the growth of mature personalities and of sound interpersonal relations. These behavior patterns will, moreover, be rigid—as are those of all neuroses.

PROMETHEUS BREAKING BONDAGE?

The number of unusual passages emphasizing the points noted above is so considerable and their appearance in widely read volumes so persistent that the Theosophist can hardly fail to see therein an indication of transition to Buddhi-manasic perceptions. For, were the forces of Kama-manas completely dominant, such observations would not be so easy to find. Despite the weaknesses of a limited Kama-manasic purview in socio-psychological thinking, new self-critical dimensions are unmistakably represented in the foregoing quoted passages.

The notorious Kinsey Report, published in the mid-1940's, serves in many ways as an example of the first—a reflection, at the level of interpersonal relationships, of the *a*morality always associated with complacent materialism. For Prof. Kinsey, in his analysis of "The Sexual Behavior of the American Male," seemed unconsciously to assume that there is no reason to criticize anything that enough people do.

PERCIPIENT CRITICISM

However, the *commentaries* published upon Dr. Kinsey's lengthy compilation of data revealed the opposition of many psychologists to the implicit "justification by percentages" of the report. Dr. Ashley Montagu, a medical professor, offered this criticism:

> The most stupendous fallacy which runs through the whole work is the authors' implied assumption that the normal is equatable with a large quantity. They do not put this in so many words, but the interpretation which they give to their findings takes the following form: It was hitherto thought that this form of behavior was relatively rare; it was therefore considered abnormal and undesirable.
>
> The implication here is that such behavior is not abnormal, but normal. . . . Since, in America, *quantity* is a moral value which makes acceptable and normalizes what in lesser quantities would be unacceptable and abnormal, the conclusion most likely to be drawn is that what has hitherto been thought unacceptable and abnormal must now be accepted and regarded as normal.

WHAT IS "NORMALITY"?

In an article in *The American Scholar* (Summer, 1948), Geoffrey Gorer, a British anthropologist, develops this criticism further. Mr.

Gorer took occasion to indict "the fundamental democratic fallacy," which he calls "Justification by Numbers":

> If a few people do or think something, it may be wrong; but if a lot of people do or think it, then it is obviously right. This argument underlies a great deal of American advertising: to state that the brand you are marketing is the "most popular brand" or "sells more than double its nearest competitor" is to suggest forcibly that it is therefore better. On the political level the votes of the majority should undoubtedly be decisive on those issues on which they are called upon to vote (and these are remarkably few); but to extend this principle to moral, psychological or physiological activities is completely illogical. . . .
>
> Behind such perceptions as these must lie some intuitive recognition of the occult facts of morality—that there is a point, in all lives, where moral relativism stops. Yet no man is ever brought to this point by religious codes built on fear. Rather, the effect of externalized morality is to undermine whatever moral sense the individual has developed and to effect a progressive deterioration in private standards of conduct. The lowest ebb of conscience is the utter separation of action and individual evaluation.

Moral Man and Immoral Society

An article in *Tidings,* publication of the Jewish Peace Fellowship (Winter, 1951), continues the same theme, asking that if a society is psychopathic, foolish, or criminal—as all societies are to a degree—must one "adjust" to that psychopathic foolishness or cruelty? The author, Abraham Myerson, a Harvard clinician, emphasizes these points by drawing political parallels: "Is a society normal in which war is extolled and the warrior is the greatest man? . . . Was it normal to adjust to the Germany of Hitler, to become a servant of the state, to lose personal worthiness, to believe in oneself and one's kind as the only *Volk,* to *"heil"* Hitler all day long, and to crush everything individual and original in oneself, except as it gave the state more power?" Another noted psychiatrist is quoted in the same issue of *Tidings:*

> The vast majority of people in our culture are well adjusted because they have given up the battle for independence sooner and more radically than the neurotic person. They have accepted the judgment of the majority so completely that they have been spared the sharp pain of conflict which the neurotic person goes through. While they are healthy from the standpoint of 'adjustment', they are more sick than the neurotic person from the standpoint of the realization of their aims as human beings.

EFFECTS ON EDUCATION

In her article, "What are the Theosophists?", H.P.B., who elsewhere spoke of her intent to "break the molds of men's minds," indicated that the Objects of the Theosophical Society could be realized only by the disenthrallment of conventional or "mass" thinking. The concluding passage speaks of the hope for future success of the Theosophical Movement, thus:

> The attainment of these objects, all agree, can best be secured by convincing the reason and warming the enthusiasm of the generation of fresh young minds, that are just ripening into maturity, and making ready to take the place of their prejudiced and conservative fathers.

MEMORY IN METALS

The discoveries made by experimental science in regard to physical nature often have metaphysical overtones of interest to Theosophists, and scientists themselves are increasingly aware that "nature" affords an exhaustless supply of wonders which lies beyond all established fact. Physicists have now come to the conclusion that even metals are capable of some form of "memory function." In the New York *Herald Tribune* for Aug. 17, 1952, John J. O'Neill reports:

> The American Institute of Physics called upon Professor B. Gross, physicist, and a director of the National Institute of Technology, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, to summarize the latest knowledge on the flow of solids for its publication "Physics Today." Dr. Gross found that many experiments could best be explained by "endowing simple metals with memory characteristics." Strains imposed on metals first rapidly, then slowly, deform them, producing what is called "creep." With long patience even the small slow changes can be measured. A second strain is placed on the bar. Does the bar mix the two strains so that they are indistinguishable? "No," says Professor Gross. "Any creep or recovery effect, once started, proceeds at its own rate quite oblivious to whatever else may happen to the specimen . . . It seems as if the sample remembers what has been done to it in the past—faintly if the previous treatment lies a long time back, and vividly if the event is recent. In a quantitative way this 'memory' finds its expression in a time function which is a measure of the gradual disappearance of the creep effect; it has been called the 'memory' function."

DISCOVERY BY NECESSITY

> Discovery of memory in metals has resulted from the necessity for making extremely precise measurements of the effects on metals

> and other solids of continuous or sudden high pressures and temperatures, as may be encountered in high-powered steam turbines, jet engines, rockets and other devices, some of which operate close to the yielding point of materials of which they are constructed.

Mr. O'Neill's discussion stresses the "mysterious" nature of memory, throughout:

> Memory is one of the highest physiological characteristics of the human being and is linked closely with the non-physical nature of life. Without memory, every intellectual process is impossible. Memory provides the basic mechanism for all thinking and other activities but continues to taunt the scientists as an elusive mystery.

No Mystery for Occultists

H.P.B.'s remarks on this subject in the Theosophical philosophy provide a "missing link" in the mystery of the memory—a mystery, perhaps, because no specific organ of the memory has yet been discovered. In *The Secret Doctrine* H.P.B. points out that while "the ordinary human brain is the registering organ of memory, but not memory itself," a non-physical agency is obviously at work. In her "Memory in the Dying" she shows the bearing of esoteric philosophy on the "elusive mystery" spoken of by Mr. O'Neill:

> The fact is that the human brain is simply the canal between two planes—the psycho-spiritual and the material—through which every abstract and metaphysical idea filters from the Manasic down to the lower human consciousness. . . . Thus while the records of even important events are often obliterated from our memory, not the most trifling action of our lives can disappear from the "Soul's" memory, because it is not memory for it, but an ever present reality on the plane which lies outside our conceptions of space and time.

Challenge to Biologists

As a result of their studies, physicists have concluded that the brain could not possibly be the sole repository of the memory patterns—because of storage limitations in the brain—and have now advanced the theory that each atom is endowed with memory. Mr. O'Neill summarizes:

> Neurologists have located the memory function in the rear third of the brain, where nerve tendrils store in the proper pattern the stimuli experienced in the motor and sensory region. So vast is the number of possible permutations in the memory patterns that it would be impossible to provide storage capacity for them in nerve tissue units.

. . . .

The only structural items that exist in the brain in sufficient numbers would be individual atoms. The new highly complex energy atom offers possibilities even to the vitalists among the biologists, but endowing atoms with a memory faculty would be a revolutionary concept. Physicists, however, have thrown this challenge to the biologist.

In *Isis Unveiled* (I, 179) is found a succinct statement on this idea:

Every organ in our body *has its own memory.* For if it is endowed with a consciousness "of its own kind," every cell must of necessity have also a memory of its own kind. The whole human body is a vast sounding board, in which each cell bears a long record of impressions connected with its parent organ, and each cell has a memory and a consciousness of its kind.

DEAD (?) METALS HAVE MEMORIES

Mr. O'Neill continues:

The mystery of memory may be either further deepened or clarified by the discoveries by physicists that "dead metals" have memories. They find that metals respond to a series of forces with reactions which indicate that they remember and react to each one individually.

Out of these studies has come the science of rheology, or the deformation of materials. To the rheologist, there exists no such thing as a perfectly rigid body; all things are thixotropic, or flow under energy stresses. Everything flows like water. Liquids move quickly; solids, slowly. Water rushes down a mountain valley at high velocity; the glacier above, a river of solid ice, flows in the same way but very slowly, and the mountains themselves are merely rock strata crumpling, folding and flowing at extremely slow rates.

"WAVE MOTION OF LIVING PARTICLES"

The new science of "rheology" confirms the view of the Occultist that there is "no such thing as *dead* matter." Some further discussion on this subject by H.P.B. should prove enlightening:

Now the Occultists, who trace every atom in the universe, whether an aggregate or single, to One Unity, or Universal *Life;* who do not recognize that anything in Nature can be *inorganic;* who know of no such thing as *dead* matter—the Occultists are consistent with their doctrine of Spirit and Soul when speaking of *memory* in every atom, of *will and sensation.* . . . We know and speak of "life-atoms"—and of "sleeping-atoms"—because we regard these two forms of energy —the kinetic and the potential—as produced by one and the same force or the One Life, and regard the latter as the source and mover of all. . . . The "wave motion of living particles" becomes compre-

> hensible on the theory of a Spiritual One Life, of a universal Vital principle independent of *our* matter, and manifesting as *atomic energy* only on *our* plane of consciousness. . . . The life-principle, or *life energy,* which is omnipresent, eternal, indestructible, is a *force* and a Principle as *noumenon,* atoms, as *phenomenon.* (*S.D.* II, 672-3.)

The Fabulous Hubbard

Time for Dec. 22 gives its usual capsule-parody of upstart religious movements by way of a discussion of L. Ron Hubbard's (Dianetics) latest tangent. Hubbard, it seems, after breaking with the group carrying on his original research at the Hubbard Dianetics Foundation in Wichita, Kansas, has discovered reincarnation. He has added a new "electrical gadget" to his dianetic auditing—an "electropsychometer" or "E-meter,"—supposed to help him locate "painful prenatal experiences." With this device Hubbard claims to have found that people have lived on other planets before this one, and that the subject's reactions to the E-meter demonstrate this conclusively. The *Time* report summarizes:

> Hubbard scrapped his old dianetics "time track" (running back to the moment of the subject's conception) and soared off through "whole track" cosmic space. In a number of booklets and pamphlets on scientology and "electropsychometry," he tells how he has discovered and isolated "Life Energy in such a form as to revive the dead or dying . . . [gained] the ability to make one's body old or young at will, the ability to heal the ill without physical contact, the ability to cure the insane and incapacitated."
>
> Everyone, it seems, is 74 trillion years old, and has been reincarnated over & over in cycles ("spirals"), which have been getting shorter as evolution has speeded up. The current spiral began a mere 35,000 years ago. Everyone has a "theta being," which represents his essential thought-energy and becomes association with a "MEST" body (another Hubword made from the initials of matter, energy, space, time).

"Scientology"

The new branch of Hubbardism is called "Scientology," and, as was the case with "Dianetics," Scientology groups are springing up all over the country. Perhaps Theosophists will be grateful that, since the master dianetician has adopted the theory of reincarnation, he has also chosen to focus the locale of previous births on other planets. So long

as such bizarre speculations are exclusively involved with the mysteries of "outer space," they are less likely to prejudice those who have recently become acquainted with a reincarnation-on-earth doctrine through such serious efforts as C. J. Ducasse's logical defence of palingenesis as a concept of moral worth. On the other hand, such phenomena as Hubbard's popular vogue, and his gravitation over a period of years to belief in prenatal existence, are perhaps indications of how inexorably the trend of popular interest is swinging away from old-time theology, and moving, however vaguely or confusedly, in a theosophic direction.

HYPNOTISM FOR EVERYBODY

In discouraging contrast to material recently reviewed here from *This Week* (See Lookout for March, p. 235) appears a breezy hypnotism come-on in *Time* for March 30. While Mr. Cannel and Mr. Paris concluded in *This Week* that the more one knows about hypnotism, the more likely he is to leave it alone, an enterprising group of doctors who want "to put hypnosis over the top for good" have intrigued *Time's* medical editors with a volume, *Hypnosis in Modern Medicine,* which emphatically endorses wide application of hypnotism. *Time* apparently concurs, remarking, quite inclusively, that hypnosis "should be reserved for those who feel that they need it because they cannot face up to the pain of even routine dental work, and for others who may have to be convinced that they should have it because of a low pain threshold, gagging or fainting." (If this isn't "Everyman," who or what is?)

"Dr. Schneck and his collaborators," continues *Time,* "still have very little idea of what the hypnotic state really is. When that is better understood, hypnosis will have a better chance of being more widely accepted." How can either Dr. Schneck or *Time* be sure?

Particularly ominous is a paragraph recommending hypnosis for disturbed children, wherein *Time* reports that a London psychiatrist "recommends using the technique in both anxiety reactions and hysterical reactions" since "children up to 15 can be hypnotized almost without exception."